

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

August 4, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.

THIS CALENDAR IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS. THEREFORE, TO FIND ALL MOTIONS AND OBJECTIONS SET FOR HEARING IN A PARTICULAR CASE, YOU MAY HAVE TO LOOK IN BOTH PARTS OF THE CALENDAR. WITHIN EACH PART, CASES ARE ARRANGED BY THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE CASE NUMBER.

THE COURT FIRST WILL HEAR ITEMS 1 THROUGH 16. A TENTATIVE RULING FOLLOWS EACH OF THESE ITEMS. THE COURT MAY AMEND OR CHANGE A TENTATIVE RULING BASED ON THE PARTIES' ORAL ARGUMENT. IF ALL PARTIES AGREE TO A TENTATIVE RULING, THERE IS NO NEED TO APPEAR FOR ARGUMENT. HOWEVER, IT IS INCUMBENT ON EACH PARTY TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER ALL OTHER PARTIES WILL ACCEPT A RULING AND FOREGO ORAL ARGUMENT. IF A PARTY APPEARS, THE HEARING WILL PROCEED WHETHER OR NOT ALL PARTIES ARE PRESENT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING, THE COURT WILL ANNOUNCE ITS DISPOSITION OF THE ITEM AND IT MAY DIRECT THAT THE TENTATIVE RULING, AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN OR AS AMENDED BY THE COURT, BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES OF THE HEARING AS THE COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

IF A MOTION OR AN OBJECTION IS SET FOR HEARING PURSUANT TO LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3015-1(c), (d) [eff. May 1, 2012], GENERAL ORDER 05-03, ¶ 3(c), LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3007-1(c)(2) [eff. through April 30, 2012], OR LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 9014-1(f)(2), RESPONDENTS WERE NOT REQUIRED TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION TO THE RELIEF REQUESTED. RESPONDENTS MAY APPEAR AT THE HEARING AND RAISE OPPOSITION ORALLY. IF THAT OPPOSITION RAISES A POTENTIALLY MERITORIOUS DEFENSE OR ISSUE, THE COURT WILL GIVE THE RESPONDENT AN OPPORTUNITY TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION AND SET A FINAL HEARING UNLESS THERE IS NO NEED TO DEVELOP THE WRITTEN RECORD FURTHER. IF THE COURT SETS A FINAL HEARING, UNLESS THE PARTIES REQUEST A DIFFERENT SCHEDULE THAT IS APPROVED BY THE COURT, THE FINAL HEARING WILL TAKE PLACE ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2014 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY AUGUST 18, 2014, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY AUGUST 25, 2014. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON THE ITEMS IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR, ITEMS 17 THROUGH 39. INSTEAD, EACH OF THESE ITEMS HAS BEEN DISPOSED OF AS INDICATED IN THE FINAL RULING BELOW. THAT RULING WILL BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES. THIS FINAL RULING MAY OR MAY NOT BE A FINAL ADJUDICATION ON THE MERITS; IF IT IS, IT INCLUDES THE COURT'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. IF ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO A CONTINUANCE OR HAVE RESOLVED THE MATTER BY STIPULATION, THEY MUST ADVISE THE COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK PRIOR TO HEARING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT VACATE THE FINAL RULING IN FAVOR OF THE CONTINUANCE OR THE STIPULATED DISPOSITION.

IF THE COURT CONCLUDES THAT FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(d) REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED, IT WILL BE SET ON AUGUST 8, 2014, AT 2:30 P.M.

August 4, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 14-26307-A-13 STEVEN PASCAL MOTION FOR
RLC-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
TAHOE KEYS MARINA & YACHT CLUB L.L.C. VS. 6-20-14 [8]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be granted and the automatic stay will be modified as set out below.

The movant leased real property to the debtor. The debtor allegedly defaulted in the payment of rent prior to the filing of the bankruptcy case. Also prior to the filing of the case, the movant served on the debtor a 3-day notice to pay or quit the premises. The debtor did neither and the movant filed and served an unlawful detainer action on the debtor. This case, however, was filed prior to the trial of that action.

Given the filing of the unlawful detainer action and the notice to quit that necessarily preceded it, the debtor's right to possession terminated assuming that there was a default under the lease and the notice to quit complied with California law. While the debtor disputes both the default under the lease and the compliance of the notice to quit with applicable nonbankruptcy law, both issues can be determined most expeditiously in state court. If there was a default under the lease and if the notice of quit was proper, the debtor no longer has an interest in the subject property which can be considered either property of the estate or an interest deserving of protection by section 362(a). In re Windmill Farms, Inc., 841 F.2d 1467 (9th Cir. 1988); In re Smith, 105 B.R. 50, 53 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1989). Therefore there is cause to modify the automatic stay. The state court may determine who is entitled to possession. If it is the debtor, he may provide for the assumption of the lease in his chapter 13 plan. If it is the movant, there is nothing for the debtor to assume and the movant may retake possession.

The automatic stay is modified to permit the movant to seek possession of the property. No fees and costs are awarded. The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) is ordered waived.

2. 14-26307-A-13 STEVEN PASCAL MOTION FOR
RPH-3 SANCTIONS
7-21-14 [42]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be denied without prejudice.

The motion seeks \$750 for three hours of legal work made necessary when Tahoe Keys Marina and Yacht Club and its attorney allegedly twice set trial on an unlawful detainer complaint after the debtor's chapter 13 bankruptcy case was filed. The action had been filed before the bankruptcy case was filed.

While moving an action forward to trial against a defendant who has filed a chapter 13 case does violate the automatic stay, 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(1), it is unclear from the record whether the state court set the trial or whether it was set by the respondents. Given that the respondents did not appear at the first date set for trial because of the automatic stay, it may be a fair inference that it was the state court that placed the action on calendar for trial.

To the extent the debtor is complaining that the respondents failed to dismiss the unlawful detainer, they were not required to do so particularly given they promptly filed a motion for relief from the automatic stay to obtain permission to go forward with the trial. They were required only to not advance the litigation until relief from the automatic stay was obtained.

3. 14-26615-A-13 HAKEEM/IRMA MUHAMMAD MOTION TO
SAC-1 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. 7-18-14 [14]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$225,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Chase Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$253,374 as of the petition date. Therefore, Bank of America, N.A.'s claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$225,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

4. 13-33623-A-13 JAMES/ELIZABETH SOLARI MOTION TO
CA-1 APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S
ATTORNEY
7-12-14 [63]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor's attorney, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the debtor, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted. The motion seeks approval of \$5,606.98 in fees and costs. After application of the \$1,350 retainer and the \$281 paid to counsel for the filing fee, a total of \$4,256.98 in additional compensation and expense reimbursement is sought by this motion. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan.

5. 13-35625-A-13 MICHAEL REED MOTION TO
CA-3 CONFIRM PLAN
6-17-14 [69]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection will be sustained.

The plan misclassifies a home loan that is in default as a Class 4 claim. Class 4 is reserved for long term secured claims not in default and not modified by the plan. The subject claim was in default when the case was filed. The failure to cure this default is a violation of the anti-modification provision in 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) and a violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) which requires secured claims provided for by a plan be paid in full.

6. 13-35625-A-13 MICHAEL REED MOTION TO
CA-4 APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S
ATTORNEY
7-7-14 [101]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor's attorney, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local

Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the debtor, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted. The motion seeks approval of \$8,179.84 in fees and costs. After application of the \$1,881 previously paid to counsel, a total of \$6,298.84 in additional compensation and expense reimbursement is sought by this motion. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan if and when it is confirmed.

7. 14-25734-A-13 WILLIAM AKIYAMA OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
7-15-14 [24]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c) (4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

Because the court has disallowed the debtor's exemption of real property in New York, the equity in that property together with the nonexempt equity in other assets, a total of more than \$94,000, must be paid to unsecured creditors. The plan will pay them only \$30,049. Therefore, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4).

8. 14-25734-A-13 WILLIAM AKIYAMA OBJECTION TO
JPJ-2 EXEMPTIONS
7-15-14 [27]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the trustee, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the debtor, the creditors, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up

the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The debtor has declared exempt pursuant to the automatic homestead of Cal. Civ. Pro. Code §§ 704.710 et seq., residential real property in New York in which the debtor did not reside on the date the bankruptcy case was filed. The trustee maintains that because the debtor did not live in the property at the commencement of the case, this exemption is not available to the debtor.

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4003(b)(1) provides that:

"[A] party in interest may file an objection to the list of property claimed as exempt within 30 days after the meeting of creditors held under § 341(a) is concluded or within 30 days after any amendment to the list or supplemental schedules is filed, whichever is later. The court may, for cause, extend the time for filing objections if, before the time to object expires, a party in interest files a request for an extension."

The objection is timely as it was filed within 30 days of the May 25, 2012 conclusion of the meeting of creditors. The objection was filed on June 25 because June 24 was a Sunday.

Turning to the merits of the objection, rights to exemptions of property are determined as of the date the petition is filed. Cisneros v. Kim (In re Kim), 257 B.R. 680, 685 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2000).

"In California, a homestead exemption may be asserted two ways. First, a declaration of homestead may be recorded. (Code Civ. Proc., § 704.920.) A recorded homestead protects the property from execution by certain creditors to the extent of the amount of the homestead exemption. (In re Mulch (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 1995) 182 B.R. 569, 572 [applying California homestead exemption].) Because many California debtors failed to file homestead declarations, the legislature in 1974 enacted legislation which created an "automatic" homestead exemption.[] (Code Civ. Proc., § 704.720.) This exemption need not be memorialized in a recorded homestead declaration in order to be effective. 'The automatic homestead exemption is available when a party has continuously resided in a dwelling from the time that a creditors' lien attaches until a court's determination in the forced sale process that the exemption does not apply.' (In re Mulch, supra, at p. 572; Webb v. Trippet (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 647, 651, 286 Cal. Rptr. 742.)"

Amin v. Khazindar, 112 Cal. App. 4th 582, 588-89 (2003).

When this case was filed, the debtor did not live in the New York property and there is no evidence that the absence from it is temporary. Therefore, the debtor is not entitled to the exemption.

9. 14-25842-A-13 TRACY GUY
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
7-14-14 [22]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of

the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records for a closely held business. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Second, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

10. 13-30043-A-13 STEVEN/JUDY KLUG
CA-8

MOTION TO
APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S
ATTORNEY
7-14-14 [79]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor's attorney, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the debtor, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted. The motion seeks approval of \$4,616.92 in fees and costs. After application of the \$2,306 paid to counsel before the filing of the case, a total of \$2,310.92 in additional compensation and expense reimbursement is sought by this motion. The foregoing represents reasonable

compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan.

11. 10-25252-A-13 LESLIE SAWYER MOTION TO
WW-6 MODIFY PLAN
6-30-14 [95]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection will be sustained.

The plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the stream of plan payments is not sufficient to fund the dividends that must be paid to creditors. The additional provisions indicate that the debtor will make a monthly plan payment of \$6859 for 0 months. The court suspects that this is a typographical error and should read 9 months. As written, the plan is under-funded.

12. 14-25654-A-13 JULIE MOORE OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
7-14-14 [27]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

The debtor has not proven the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). The plan assumes that a home lender has agreed to a home loan modification. Absent that agreement, the claim cannot be modified. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2). Instead, the debtor is limited to curing any pre-petition default while maintaining the regular monthly mortgage installment. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(5). The plan does not do this.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

13. 14-26058-A-13 RONALD SAWYER AND SUE OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 HARNESS CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
7-15-14 [27]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained in part and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

The plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value/lien avoidance motion concerning the collateral of Springleaf Financial Services in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. No such motion has been filed, served, and granted. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Given that the debtor no longer owns the \$90,000 real property, the objection that the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) will be overruled.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

14. 14-25862-A-13 STEVEN/SHARON COLLINS OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
7-14-14 [20]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the

hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$4,151 is less than the \$5,375 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

Second, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, the debtor failed to attach to Schedules I and J detailed statements of the debtor's business income and expenses. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Third, the debtor has failed to corroborate the value of the debtor's real estate. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). And, the failure to establish such values means the debtor cannot demonstrate that the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

15. 13-34596-A-13 MARIO/EVELYN GUNSON
CA-1

MOTION TO
APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S
ATTORNEY
7-14-14 [19]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor's attorney, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the debtor, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted. The motion seeks approval of \$4,526.52 in fees and

costs. After application of the \$2,781 previously paid to counsel, a total of \$1,745.52 in additional compensation and expense reimbursement is sought by this motion. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan.

16. 13-34996-A-13 CHRISTINE GORDON
CA-2

MOTION TO
APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S
ATTORNEY
7-14-14 [26]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor's attorney, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the debtor, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted. The motion seeks approval of \$4,374.90 in fees and costs. After application of the \$1,631 previously paid to counsel, a total of \$2,743.90 in additional compensation and expense reimbursement is sought by this motion. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan.

THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

17. 14-23102-A-13 ANGELA SKELLENGER MOTION TO
MRL-1 CONFIRM PLAN
6-12-14 [28]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

18. 14-25902-A-13 ERNESTINE OUTLIN OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN ETC
7-15-14 [20]

Final Ruling: The trustee's request to continue the hearing to August 18 at 1:30 p.m. is granted. The trustee may file and serve an amended objection on or before August 8 and the debtor may file and served opposition to any amended objection on or before August 15.

19. 14-25902-A-13 ERNESTINE OUTLIN COUNTER MOTION TO
JPJ-1 WAIVE DEBTOR EDUCATION REQUIREMENT
AND FOR APPOINTMENT OF PERSONAL
REPRESENTATIVE
7-22-14 [23]

Final Ruling: Because the court has granted the trustee's request to continue the hearing to August 18 at 1:30 p.m., the hearing on this counter-motion is likewise continued. The trustee may file and serve opposition to the counter-motion on or before August 8 and the debtor may file and served a reply to any opposition on or before August 15.

20. 14-26307-A-13 STEVEN PASCAL MOTION TO
RPH-1 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. SARTORIO FAMILY TRUST 7-2-14 [20]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$17,550 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$17,550 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$17,550 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

21. 14-22508-A-13 ARTURO/ROSANA BUSTOS MOTION TO
JLB-3 CONFIRM PLAN
6-24-14 [24]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(3) and (b)(1) require that when the debtor files and serves a motion to confirm a chapter 13 plan, the motion to confirm it must be set for hearing on 42 days of notice to all creditors, the chapter 13 trustee, and the U.S. Trustee. If any of these parties in interest wish to object to the confirmation of the plan, they must file and serve a written objection at least 14 days prior to the hearing. See Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(b)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1)(B). The debtor's notice of the hearing on the motion to confirm the plan must advise all parties in interest of the deadline for filing written objections. See Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(d)(3).

This procedure complies with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(b), which requires a minimum of 28 days of notice of the deadline for objections to confirmation as well as the hearing on confirmation of the plan. Because Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) requires that written opposition be filed 14 days prior to the hearing but Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b) requires 28 days of notice of the deadline for filing opposition, the debtor must give 42 days of notice of the hearing.

Here, the debtor gave only 41 days of notice of the hearing. Therefore, parties in interest received only 27 days notice of the deadline for filing and serving written opposition to the motion. Notice was insufficient.

22. 14-22808-A-13 MARY GILL MOTION TO
MRL-3 DISMISS CASE
7-21-14 [40]

Final Ruling: The movant has voluntarily dismissed the motion.

23. 11-43812-A-13 MARK SAMS MOTION TO
WW-1 MODIFY PLAN
6-26-14 [36]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The motion will be granted on the condition that the plan is further modified in the confirmation order to account for the prior payments totaling \$108,750

made by the debtor under the terms of the previously confirmed plan. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

24. 13-25215-A-13 SHARILYNN BONNARD
SDB-3

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
6-30-14 [71]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

25. 14-24219-A-13 DAVID/KAREN WARN
PGM-1

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
6-18-14 [34]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

26. 09-43940-A-13 PETER BEST AND OLA ADAMS-
PGM-9 BEST

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
6-27-14 [159]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The motion will be granted on the condition that the plan is further modified in the confirmation order to account for the \$172,692.52 in prior plan payments, and to provide for a plan payment of \$4,600 in July 2014, then four monthly payments of \$3,300. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

27. 14-24949-A-13 MARY LOUISE PADLO

ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
7-16-14 [34]

Final Ruling: The order to show cause will be discharged.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay the \$70 installment when due on July 11. However, after the issuance of the order to show cause, the delinquent installment was paid. No prejudice was caused by the late payment.

28. 14-26849-A-13 VITALIY LUKINSKIY AND
MS-1 OLGA LUKISKAYA
VS. FIRST RESOLUTION INVESTMENT CORP.

MOTION TO
AVOID JUDICIAL LIEN
7-1-14 [8]

Final Ruling: This motion to avoid a judicial lien has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). The subject real property has a value of \$219,230 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable liens total \$290,893.22. The debtor has an available exemption of \$1. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

29. 14-26849-A-13 VITALIY LUKINSKIY AND
MS-2 OLGA LUKISKAYA
VS. MIDLAND FUNDING, L.L.C.

MOTION TO
AVOID JUDICIAL LIEN
7-1-14 [13]

Final Ruling: This motion to avoid a judicial lien has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). The subject real property has a value of \$219,230 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable liens total \$290,893.22. The debtor has an available exemption of \$1. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A),

there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

30. 14-26849-A-13 VITALIY LUKINSKIY AND MOTION TO
MS-3 OLGA LUKISKAYA VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A. 7-1-14 [18]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$219,230 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Ocwen Loan Servicing. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$290,893.22 as of the petition date. Therefore, JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.'s claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a

contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$219,230. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

31. 14-24253-A-13 ROMY OSTER
JPJ-2
OBJECTION TO
EXEMPTIONS
6-30-14 [40]

Final Ruling: The objection will be dismissed as moot. The case was dismissed on July 23, 2014.

32. 14-26253-A-13 MATTHEW MINCH
JPJ-1
OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
7-14-14 [22]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The objection and the motion will be dismissed as moot. Because the debtor has amended his exemptions, the confirmation problems caused by the absence of objections are no longer present.

33. 14-26253-A-13 MATTHEW MINCH
JPJ-2
OBJECTION TO
EXEMPTIONS
7-15-14 [25]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its

consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The objection will be dismissed as moot.

The trustee objects to all of the debtor's Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b) exemptions claimed on Schedule C. The trustee argues that because the debtor is married and because the debtor's spouse has not joined in the chapter 13 petition, the debtor must file his spouse's waiver of right to claim exemptions. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(a)(2). This was not done.

A debtor's exemptions are determined as of the date the bankruptcy petition is filed. Owen v. Owen, 500 U.S. 305, 314 (1991); see also In re Chappell, 373 B.R. 73, 77 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2007) (holding that "critical date for determining exemption rights is the petition date"). Thus, the court applies the facts and law existing on the date the case was commenced to determine the nature and extent of the debtor's exemptions.

11 U.S.C. § 522(b)(1) permits the states to opt out of the federal exemption statutory scheme set forth in section 522(d). In enacting Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.130, the State of California opted out of the federal exemption scheme relegating a debtor to whatever exemptions are provided under state law. Thus, substantive issues regarding the allowance or disallowance of a claimed exemption are governed by state law in California.

California state law gives debtors filing for bankruptcy the right to choose (1) a set of state law exemptions similar but not identical to the Bankruptcy Code exemptions; or (2) California's regular non-bankruptcy exemptions. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 703.130, 703.140. In the case of a married debtor, if either spouse files for bankruptcy individually, California's regular non-bankruptcy exemptions apply unless, while the bankruptcy case is pending, both spouses waive in writing the right to claim the regular non-bankruptcy state exemptions in any bankruptcy proceeding filed by the other spouse. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(a)(2).

Here, the debtor is asserting the exemptions of Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b), which require a spousal waiver. That waiver was not filed with the petition. However, it was filed on July 23 after the objection was filed. To the extent the trustee may have objections to the amended exemptions, those exemptions should be timely interposed in a new objection.

34.	10-48354-A-13 ELLEN TORNGREN SDB-3 VS. SANTANDER BANK, N.A.	MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL 6-30-14 [48]
-----	---	---

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$260,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by US Bank Home Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$547,921 as of the petition date. Therefore, Santander Bank, N.A.'s claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the abovetreatment, violates In re Hobby, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining

whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a) (5) .

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$260,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

35. 12-39367-A-13 JAMES/MELISSA TREMAINE MOTION TO
JPJ-4 MODIFY PLAN
6-11-14 [49]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

36. 14-22885-A-13 MARK/LISA THARALDSEN MOTION TO
CK-5 CONFIRM PLAN
6-23-14 [51]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The motion will be granted and the objection will be overruled. The objection notes that no order has been entered on the valuation motion concerning the collateral of Wells Fargo Home Mortgage. However, an order was entered on July 23.

37. 14-25389-A-13 FRANK NAVARRETTE OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 EXEMPTIONS
6-30-14 [15]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The objection will be dismissed as moot. While the trustee is correct in his assertion that the debtor must elect between Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 703 and 704, and failed to do so in the original Schedule C, amended Schedule C limits the debtor's exemptions to section 704. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 703.140(a)(1) and (3).

To the extent the trustee may have objections to the amended exemptions, those exemptions should be timely interposed in a new objection.

38. 14-24896-A-13 STANLEY WOO
JPJ-1

AMENDED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
7-11-14 [30]

Final Ruling: This matter was filed pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). At the preliminary hearing, the debtor informed the court that there was opposition to the objection and motion and briefly outlined that opposition. The court then set a briefing schedule, requiring the debtor to file and serve written opposition on or before July 28. The debtor failed to file that opposition. Given this failure, the court concludes that the debtor does not contest the merits of the objection and the motion to dismiss the case. Therefore, a further hearing will not be helpful to the court's resolution of this matter. The matter is removed from calendar for resolution without further argument. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006).

The objection will be sustained and the case will be dismissed.

First, the debtor failed to appear at the continued meeting of creditors as required by the trustee. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, the debtor admitted that the debtor's 2013 income tax return has not been filed.

Prior to the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 becoming effective, the Bankruptcy Code did not require chapter 13 debtors to file delinquent tax returns. If a debtor did not file tax returns, the trustee might object to the plan on the grounds of lack of feasibility or that the plan was not proposed in good faith. See, e.g., Greatwood v. United States (In re Greatwood), 194 B.R. 637 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1996), *affirmed*, 120 F.3d. 268 (9th Cir. 1997).

Since BAPCPA became effective, a chapter 13 debtor must file most pre-petition delinquent tax returns. See 11 U.S.C. § 1308. Section 1308(a) requires a chapter 13 debtor who has failed to file tax returns under applicable nonbankruptcy law to file all such returns if they were due for tax periods during the 4-year period ending on the date of the filing of the petition. The delinquent returns must be filed by the date of the meeting of creditors.

In this case, the meeting of creditors was held and concluded. While it is possible for the deadline to file the delinquent returns to be extended, to receive an extension the trustee hold the meeting of creditors open. See 11 U.S.C. § 1308(b). The trustee did not hold the meeting open. Hence, the deadline for filing the delinquent returns has expired and it is impossible for the debtor to comply with section 1308.

There are two consequences to a failure to comply with section 1308. The

failure is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(e). In this case, however, the trustee has not moved for dismissal. Also, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(9) and an uncodified provision of BAPCPA found at section 1228(a) of the Act provide that the court cannot confirm a plan if delinquent returns have not been filed with the taxing agency and filed with the court. This has not been done and so the court cannot confirm any plan proposed by the debtor.

Third, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records relating to his self-employment income. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

39.	14-24896-A-13 STANLEY WOO SMR-1 PROFIT INVESTMENT COMPANY, INC. VS.	AMENDED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 7-15-14 [34]
-----	---	--

Final Ruling: This matter was filed pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). At the preliminary hearing, the debtor informed the court that there was opposition to the objection and briefly outlined that opposition. The court then set a briefing schedule, requiring the debtor to file and serve written opposition on or before July 28. The debtor failed to file that opposition. Given this failure, the court concludes that the debtor does not contest the merits of the objection. Therefore, a further hearing will not be helpful to the court's resolution of this matter. The matter is removed from calendar for resolution without further argument. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006).

The objection will be sustained to the extent the court has sustained the trustee's objection (JPJ-1) and for the reasons stated in the ruling on the trustee's objection. To the extent this objection raises additional issues, it is unnecessary to reach their merit.